

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed May 12, 2009, considered and rejected claims 1-9, 22-25, 27-35, 41, and 43-50. Claims 48-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moreh* et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6959336) and further in view of *Bush* et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2002/0083012). Claims 1, 9, 27, 35, and 45-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moreh* in view of *Bush* and *Quinlan* et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,784,365). Claims 2-3, 8, 22, 28-29 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moreh* and further in view of *Bush* and *Quinlan* and *Wood* et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,609,198). Claims 4-5, 30-31, 41, 43-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moreh* and further in views of *Bush* and *Quinlan* and *Sweet* (U.S. Publ. No. 2002/0031230). Claims 7 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moreh* and further in views of *Bush*, *Quinlan* and *Leah* et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,986,039). Claims 6 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moreh* and further in views of *Bush*, *Quinlan*, *Sweet* and *Laursen* et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,065,120).¹

By this response, claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 27, 30, 32, 33, and 46-48 are amended, while claims 2, 3, 5, 28, 29, and 31 are canceled. Support for the amendments may be found in paragraphs 51, 55, and 58, as well as in figure 4. Claims 1, 4, 6-9, 22-25, 27, 30, 32-35, 41, and 43-50 remain pending of which claims 1, 27, and 48 are independent.

The current amendments have been made to specify that different credentials are stored in different credential stores. Therefore, the independent claims now contain limitations for determining which store to access to validate credentials based on the type of credentials inputted. The claims have also been amended to clarify that the unique user identifier is returned to the requesting device which uses the identifier to access a service.

The independent claims were objected to for failing to comply with the written description requirement due to the added limitation that states that a second set of credentials are validated to return the same unique user identifier as when the first set of credentials is validated. Applicant submits that multiple portions of the specification support this language as this is a key aspect of the invention. For example, paragraph 52 states that regardless of which set of

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

credentials are used, the same user identifier is returned. Paragraph 58 also states that "each of the credentials that is associated with a particular user can be stored in different physical locations, but all of the credentials are linked through a unique user identifier, which may be invisible or unknown to the user." Applicant, therefore, submits that the claim limitations are supported by the specification.

The new limitations in the independent claims are somewhat similar to various limitations that appeared previously in the dependent claims such as claims 5-7. These dependent claims referred to asymmetric and symmetric association of the credentials with the user identifier. The new limitations clarify that each set of credentials is stored in a particular store depending on the type of credential and that the particular store is accessed to validate the credential. This specific aspect of symmetric and asymmetric association, however, did not appear previously in the claims. The currently cited art does not address this aspect, and therefore fails to teach or suggest these limitations of the independent claims as claimed in combination with the remaining limitations.

For example, in Leah, which was cited to reject claim 7, a master registry is maintained for storing the master copy of credentials. Other registries are also maintained for storing copies of the credentials. Therefore, the separate locations are only used to store the same (i.e. copies of the same) credentials rather than different credentials that are associated with the same account.

On the other hand, Sweet, which was cited to reject claim 5, only discloses the use of a single set of credentials per user. Therefore, it cannot teach storing multiple sets of credentials in different stores when the multiple sets are associated with the same user account.

Additionally, the cited portion of Laursen, which was cited to reject claim 6, does not relate to storing different sets of credentials in multiple stores.

Finally, the only reference that discloses using different sets of credentials to access the same account is the Bush reference. However, in Bush a single server with a single accounts database is used for storing the credentials. *See* Fig. 2-3; ¶¶ 26-27 (describing the accounts database on the server). Therefore, none of the references disclose the storing of different sets of credentials for the same account in different stores.

As such, the combination of cited art fails to teach or suggest: "determining based on the first set of credentials being a username and password *that a first credential store is to be accessed to validate the authentication request from the desktop computer, the first credential*

store storing sets of credentials that each comprise a username and password;" "validating the first set of credentials provided by the user *by accessing the first credential store* to determine whether the username and password are associated with a single unique user identifier, wherein each set of credentials in the first credential store is associated with a single unique user identifier of a user, a single unique user account, and a single unique user profile such that upon determining that the first set of credentials is associated with a unique user identifier, the unique user identifier is returned to the desktop computer such that the desktop computer may use the unique user identifier to access a service;" "determining based on the second set of credentials being a numeric username and a numeric pin *that a second credential store is to be accessed to validate the authentication request from the cellular phone, the second credential store storing sets of credentials that each comprise a numeric username and a numeric pin;*" and "validating the second set of credentials provided by the user *by accessing the second credential store* to determine whether the numeric username and numeric pin are associated with a single unique user identifier, wherein each set of credentials in the second credential store is also associated with a single unique user identifier of a user, a single unique user account, and a single unique user profile such that upon determining that the second set of credentials is associated with the same unique user identifier as the first set of credentials, the unique user identifier is returned to the cellular phone such that the cellular phone may use the unique user identifier to access the service."

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 12th day of August, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian D. Tucker/

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
BRIAN D. TUCKER
Registration No. 61,550
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

RDN:BDT:gd
2411638_1.DOC